arXiv:1703.08224v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 21 Apr 2017

Emulating Majorana fermions and their braiding by Ising spin chains

Stefan Backens,[1] Alexander Shnirman,[1] Yuriy Makhlin,[2,3] Yuval Gefen,[4] Johan E. Mooij,[5] and Gerd Schön[6,7]

[1] *Institut für Theorie der Kondensierten Materie, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[2] *Condensed-matter physics Laboratory, National Research University Higher School of Economics, 101000 Moscow, Russia*
[3] *Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, acad. Semyonov av. 1a, 142432, Chernogolovka, Russia*
[4] *Department of Condensed Matter Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, 76100 Rehovot, Israel*
[5] *Kavli Institute of Nanoscience, Delft University of Technology, 2628 CJ Delft, The Netherlands*
[6] *Institut für Theoretische Festkörperphysik, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[7] *Institute of Nanotechnology, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany*

(Dated: April 24, 2017)

We analyse the control of Majorana zero-energy states by mapping the fermionic system onto a chain of Ising spins. Although the topological protection is lost for the Ising chain, the properties of this system provide added insight into the nature of the quantum states. By controlling the local magnetic field, the Ising chain can be separated into topological and non-topological parts. In this paper we propose (topologically non-protected) schemes which allow performing the braiding operation, and in fact also more general rotations. We consider a T-junction geometry, but we also propose a protocol for a strictly one-dimensional setup. Both setups rely on an extra spin-1/2 coupler included either in the T-junction, or as part of the chain such that it controls one of the Ising links. Depending on the quantum state of the coupler, this link can be either ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic. The coupler can be manipulated once the topological parts of the chain hosting the Majorana fermions are moved far away. Our scheme overcomes limitations which are a consequence of the 1D character of the Jordan-Wigner transformation. We also propose an experimental implementation of our scheme based on a chain of flux qubits with a design providing the needed control fields.

I. INTRODUCTION

Theoretically Majorana zero-energy states (also known as Majorana fermions) arise as a property of the Kitaev chain[1]. A physical realization is provided by a one-dimensional (1D) p-wave superconductor or – more accessible to experiment – by a semiconducting wire with strong spin-orbit interaction and proximity-induced superconductivity[2]. A fundamental elementary quantum gate, the braiding[3] operation, can be performed in these systems if one uses a T-junction geometry[4]. This adiabatic manipulation allows for a restricted class of operations only; in order to construct a universal set of gates, it is necessary to expand the set of gates by non-adiabatic manipulations.

Mathematically closely related is a 1D Ising chain, which can be mapped onto the Kitaev chain via the Jordan-Wigner transformation. The ideal systems are exactly equivalent, however, they differ[5] in a crucial way in the presence of disorder, e.g., due to random fields. The Majorana states in the Kitaev chain or p-wave superconductor are topologically protected (with exponential accuracy). I.e., local perturbations due to disorder do not lift the degeneracy of the ground states. Similarly the system remains topologically protected during the adiabatic braiding operation. In contrast, a local longitudinal magnetic field in the Ising chain does lift the degeneracy. The origin of this difference is the non-local nature of the Jordan-Wigner transformation.

Nevertheless, despite the lack of topological protection, simulating the physics of Majorana fermions by artificially constructed Ising chains could provide substantial insight (see, e.g., the proposals of Refs.[6,7]). Short Ising chains exhibiting Majorana physics have already been simulated in optical systems[8,9]. With present-day Josephson qubit circuits, which have reached an encouraging level of coherence, the Majorana physics could now be studied for interesting length and time scales. Several proposals on how to emulate Majorana states with Josephson circuits have already been formulated (see, e.g., Ref.[10,11]), but as a consequence of the 1D character of the Jordan-Wigner transformation the extension to a T-junction geometry, intended to perform the braiding operation, remains problematic.

In this paper we first present a setup which allows performing the braiding operation in a T-junction geometry. It relies on an extra spin-1/2 controlling the three-spin coupling in the junction. However, we also propose a scheme which allows (non-protected) braiding in a strictly 1D geometry. This is achieved by attaching an extra spin-1/2 (the coupler) to the chain, such that one of the links of the Ising chain is controlled by this spin. Depending on the quantum state of the coupler, this link can be either ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic, or a superposition thereof. The coupler can and should be manipulated once the topological part of the chain containing the Majoranas has been moved sufficiently far away. An added advantage of our scheme is that it allows for performing parity-conserving $U(1)$ rotations of the Majorana qubit by an *arbitrary angle*, whereas the topologically protected braiding in the fermionic

system fixes this angle to discrete multiples of $\pi/4$. In this way we can construct a universal set of quantum logical gates.

We also propose an experimental implementation of our 1D scheme based on a specific setup of chains of Josephson qubits. In particular flux qubits are suited because they can be strongly coupled and their tunnelling strength, which plays the role of the transverse field, can be efficiently tuned[12].

II. ISING CHAIN

Let us first recall some well-known relations between Ising chains and Majorana fermions. An Ising chain is assumed to be described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} h(n)\,\sigma^x(n) - J\sum_{n=1}^{N-1}\sigma^z(n)\,\sigma^z(n+1)\ . \tag{1}$$

For definiteness we consider the ferromagnetic case, $J>0$. By controlling the transverse fields $h(n)$ at each site, we can define a topological (ferromagnetic) domain, which is an interval in which $h(n)\ll J$. In the rest of the chain we keep $h(n)\gg J$, and the spins are "frozen" in the state $|{\rightarrow_x}\rangle$, the $(+1)$-eigenstate of σ_x. The two "ground states" $|{\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle$ and $|{\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle$ of the topological qubit are nearly degenerate. If $h(n)=0$ for all n in the topological domain, the degeneracy is exact. The ground states remains degenerate even if $h(n)$ vanishes at a single site. For non-vanishing, small $h(n)$ a residual hybridisation between these two states decays exponentially as a function of the length of the ferromagnetic domain. By switching the transverse fields $h(n)$ on and off, one can adiabatically control the size and position of the topological interval.

In order to map this problem to a fermionic system, we use the Jordan–Wigner transformation

$$\chi(n) = \sigma^z(n)\prod_{p=1}^{n-1}\sigma^x(p)\ , \tag{2}$$

$$\eta(n) = \sigma^y(n)\prod_{p=1}^{n-1}\sigma^x(p)\ , \tag{3}$$

with fermionic Majorana operators $\chi(n)$, $\eta(n)$ satisfying the anticommutation relations

$$\{\chi(n),\chi(m)\}_+ = 2\,\delta_{nm}\ , \tag{4}$$

$$\{\eta(n),\eta(m)\}_+ = 2\,\delta_{nm}\ , \tag{5}$$

$$\{\chi(n),\eta(m)\}_+ = 0\ . \tag{6}$$

This yields a fermionic representation of the Hamiltonian:

$$H = -\mathrm{i}\sum_{n=1}^{N} h(n)\,\chi(n)\,\eta(n) - \mathrm{i}\,J\sum_{n=1}^{N-1}\eta(n)\,\chi(n+1) \tag{7}$$

In particular, for $h(n)=0$, the two boundary operators $\gamma_L\equiv\chi(1)$ and $\gamma_R\equiv\eta(N)$ do not appear in H and represent the famous zero-energy Majorana fermions[1]. The degeneracy of the ground state is most conveniently presented in terms of the occupation number of the Dirac fermion $d_0=(\gamma_L-\mathrm{i}\gamma_R)/2$, so that $\mathrm{i}\gamma_R\gamma_L = 2d_0^\dagger d_0 - 1$. In what follows we will also use alternative notations $\gamma_L\to\gamma_{\rm in}$, $\gamma_R\to\gamma_{\rm out}$.

To identify the eigenstates with well-defined fermion occupation numbers, we use $\gamma_L=\chi(1)=\sigma^z(1)$ and $\gamma_R=\eta(N)=\sigma^y(N)\prod_{p=1}^{N-1}\sigma^x(p)=\sigma^y(N)\sigma^x(N)P=-\mathrm{i}\sigma^z(N)P$. Here we introduced the parity operator $P\equiv\prod_{p=1}^{N}\sigma^x(p)$. Thus we have

$$\gamma_L\,|{\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle = |{\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle\ , \tag{8}$$

$$\gamma_L\,|{\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle = -\,|{\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle\ , \tag{9}$$

$$\gamma_R\,|{\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle = \mathrm{i}\,|{\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle\ , \tag{10}$$

$$\gamma_R\,|{\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle = -\mathrm{i}\,|{\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle\ . \tag{11}$$



FIG. 1: Three Ising chains. **Left panel**: Ising coupling between the chains. Here, a fictitious spin $\vec{S}$ is introduced formally in order to construct the Klein factors. This doubles the Hilbert space and creates effectively two equivalent copies of the system. This is the price one has to pay in order to have a simple fermionic description. **Right panel**: A central spin $\vec{S}$ controls the coupling between the chains via 3-spin interaction.

From here it is easy to see that the states

$$|0\rangle \equiv \frac{|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \ , \tag{12}$$

$$|1\rangle \equiv \frac{|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{13}$$

satisfy, as expected, $d_0^\dagger\,|0\rangle = |1\rangle$, $d_0\,|1\rangle = |0\rangle$, $d_0^\dagger\,|1\rangle = d_0\,|0\rangle = 0$.

III. T-JUNCTION WITH 3 ISING CHAINS

We consider now 3 Ising chains ordered such that the first spins in each chain can be coupled to each other (see Fig. 1). The Hamiltonian of each chain with index $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ reads

$$H_\alpha = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} h_\alpha(n)\,\sigma_\alpha^x(n) - J\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \sigma_\alpha^z(n)\,\sigma_\alpha^z(n+1) \ . \tag{14}$$

One could now try to generalize the Jordan–Wigner transformation by introducing a global 1-D ordering (that is, numbering all the sites in some order). Any such order is artificial and leads to non-local interactions. Instead we use a modified Jordan-Wigner transformation, similar to one of those proposed in Ref.[13], introducing an extra spin denoted by the Pauli matrices S^α,

$$\chi_\alpha(n) = S^\alpha\,\sigma_\alpha^z(n)\prod_{p=1}^{n-1}\sigma_\alpha^x(p) \ , \tag{15}$$

$$\eta_\alpha(n) = S^\alpha\,\sigma_\alpha^y(n)\prod_{p=1}^{n-1}\sigma_\alpha^x(p) \ . \tag{16}$$

This extra spin provides Klein factors. The Hamiltonian of each chain is again of the form (7), and due to the extra operators S^α the Majorana operators belonging to different chains anticommute. Thus, we have properly "fermionised" the whole system. In what follows it will be important to know the commutation relations between S^α and the Majorana operators (15) and (16),

$$\begin{aligned} [S^\alpha, \chi_\alpha(n)]_- = 0 \quad &, \quad [S^\alpha, \eta_\alpha(n)]_- = 0 \ , \\ \{S^\alpha, \chi_\beta(n)\}_+ = 0 \quad &, \quad \{S^\alpha, \eta_\beta(n)\}_+ = 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha \neq \beta. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

To proceed one could introduce additional Ising couplings between the first spins of each chain, as indicated in the left panel of Fig. 1, with Hamiltonian

$$H_{\rm int}^{\rm Ising} = -\sum_{\alpha<\beta} J_{\alpha\beta}\,\sigma_\alpha^z(1)\sigma_\beta^z(1) \ . \tag{18}$$

In the fermionic representation this reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm int}^{\rm Ising} &= -\sum_{\alpha<\beta} J_{\alpha\beta}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,S^\alpha\,\chi_\beta(1)\,S^\beta \\ &= \sum_{\alpha<\beta} J_{\alpha\beta}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,\chi_\beta(1)\,S^\alpha\,S^\beta \\ &= \mathrm{i}\sum_{\alpha<\beta} J_{\alpha\beta}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,\chi_\beta(1)\,\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\,S^\gamma\ . \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The last form of Eq. (19) suggests a connection to the Kondo model, which was explored in Ref.[14] (this is most interesting for critical Ising chains, i.e., $h \approx J$). This connection may not be obvious, since some spin and fermionic operators do not commute with each other, cf. Eq. (17). To overcome this obstacle, one can use a modified Jordan-Wigner transformation[13], which is however irrelevant for our purposes and will not be discussed here. Furthermore, we note that the simple Ising coupling between the chains (18) does not lead to a quadratic Hamiltonian in terms of Majorana fermions. This will influence protocols intended to perform braiding in such systems[15] and possibly lead to errors.

As an alternative we suggest proceeding with another coupling Hamiltonian, as illustrated in the right panel of Fig. 1. It relies on a three-spin interaction with an extra spin-1/2 with components S^α in the junction. We call this extra spin the "coupler". The Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\rm int}^{S} = -\frac{1}{2}{\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}' J_{\alpha\beta} S^\gamma \sigma_\alpha^z(1)\,\sigma_\beta^z(1) \tag{20}$$

with summation over mutually distinct α, β, γ and $J_{\alpha\beta} = J_{\beta\alpha}$. The fermionic version of this coupling reads

$$H_{\rm int}^{S} = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} J_{\alpha\beta}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,\chi_\beta(1)\,, \tag{21}$$

with the Levi-Civita symbol $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$. Thus the coupling (20) leads to a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian; cf. a similar discusson in Ref.[13] and three-spin couplings employed in Refs[8,9]. This ensures that braiding can be performed by standard methods[4]. The operators S^α disappear from the Hamiltonian. Yet, as we will see below, the spin is not decoupled since S^α do not, in general, commute with $H_{\rm int}^S$ (cf. Eqs. (17)).

The coupling (20) is peculiar and may be not easy to realize in an experiment. However, there are further possibilities, i.e., braiding in 1-D geometry, which we discuss in the following section.

IV. BRAIDING IN A 1-D CHAIN GEOMETRY

To introduce the 1-D braiding, we, first, review the braiding protocol in a T-junction geometry of Ref. 4, focusing on the case where there is one topological domain in one of the arms. At each stage of the braiding protocol only one of three couplings $J_{\alpha\beta}$ is switched on and the topological domain (ferromagnetic domain in spin terms) is adiabatically transported through the coupler. In terms of spin, at each stage we have just one Ising chain formed by the two coupled chains α and β. The coupling,

$$H_{\rm int}^{S} = -J_{\alpha\beta}\,\sigma_\alpha^z(1)\,\sigma_\beta^z(1)\,S^\gamma\,, \tag{22}$$

is an Ising coupling (with mutually distinct α, β, γ; no summation is implied). For $J_{\alpha\beta} > 0$, the coupling is ferromagnetic if the coupler is in the $(+1)$-eigenstate of S^γ and antiferromagnetic if the coupler is in the (-1)-eigenstate. In general, the coupler can be thought of as an object that creates a "coherent superposition" of a ferromagnetic and an antiferromagnetic Ising link.

Analysing the braiding protocol in terms of spins, we understand the reason for the non-trivial spin dynamics as follows: When the topological (ferromagnetic) interval is adiabatically transported through the coupler, the spins of the domain remain intact if the coupling is ferromagnetic ($S^\gamma = +1$) and flip if the coupling is antiferromagnetic ($S^\gamma = -1$). If the coupler is in a superposition of the two states, the coupler and the ferromagnetic domain become entangled. The comparison to the braiding protocol for Majorana modes[4] shows that the braiding is achieved after the topological domain is transported through all three components S^1, S^2, and S^3 in sequence. This is also confirmed by a direct calculation in the spin language presented below.



FIG. 2: Two Ising chains coupled via the central spin $\vec{S}$.

Based on this considerations we suggest using an alternative approach to emulate the braiding in a purely one-dimensional geometry: consider a system of only two chains ($\alpha = 1$ and 2), with the chain coupling given by only one of the terms in Eq. (20), $H^S_{\rm int} = -J_{12}\sigma^z_1(1)\sigma^z_2(1)\,S^3$ (see Fig. 2). Transport of the topological domain through all three components S^1, S^2, and S^3 can be emulated by rotating the state of the coupler between the stages of the protocol. Depending on the angles of rotations this also provides a generalisation of a single-domain braiding protocol, which allows for an arbitrary rotation angle, cf. below. Moreover, a single intermediate rotation is sufficient as we will demonstrate.

To illustrate this, let us first consider the braiding operation in a T-junction from Ref. 4 in the spin language. During this operation the topological domain, initially placed in the left leg, $\alpha = 1$, is transported first through the upper link of the coupler region to the right leg, $\alpha = 2$, then through the right link to the lower leg, $\alpha = 3$, and finally through the left link back to the left leg. Let us consider the effect of these operations, first in the spin language. During the first stage, if $S^3 = +1$, the state of the topological region (qubit) is conserved, while for $S^3 = -1$ the up- and down-states (all spins up resp. down) are interchanged. Let us define in the (low-energy) qubit space the operators $\hat{\tau}^{x,y,z}$, given by Pauli matrices in this up-down ($|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$) basis. In the Heisenberg picture, we find that during the first stage τ^x and S^3 are conserved, while $\tau^{y,z} \to S^3\tau^{y,z}$ and $S^{1,2} \to \tau^x S^{1,2}$. At the second and third stages transformations are similar, with the part of S^3 played by S^1 and S^2, respectively. A combination of all three stages conserves τ^x and the three coupler spin components S^1, S^2, S^3, while $\tau^y \to -\tau^z$ and $\tau^z \to \tau^y$. In other words, the coupler spin is again disentangled from the qubit (though they are entangled during the process), and the braiding operation is achieved (an x-rotation in the language of pseudospin $\boldsymbol{\tau}$). Indeed, within the doubly degenerate ground state the two fermionic Majorana operators, $\gamma_{\rm in} = \tau^z$ and $\gamma_{\rm out} = \tau^y$ are interchanged (see Eqs. (2,3) and after Eq. (7)): $\gamma_{\rm in} \to \gamma_{\rm out}$, $\gamma_{\rm out} \to -\gamma_{\rm in}$.

In the considered 1D geometry, one can pull the topological region (qubit) through the only Ising link, controlled by the coupler spin. This link is controlled by S^3, while S^1- and S^2-pullings are not available, which limits the accessible possibilities. However, one could emulate various coupler-spin components by rotations of the coupler spin between the pulling operations. Thus, for instance, one can achieve braiding by pulling the qubit through the coupler three times with proper coupler-spin rotations in between. The rotations should be chosen in such a manner that three spin components replace S^3 in sequence. This statement can be also confirmed by a direct calculation of the evolution of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ operators. However, one can achieve a 'braiding rotation' (see below) with an even shorter manipulation as we describe in the next paragraph.

Indeed, the full braiding, which we have just described, is achieved after a sequence of three pulling operations — pulling via S^3, S^1, and S^2. However, we notice that the operator S^2 returns to its initial value after the first two stages (this follows from the observation that all three coupler-spin components return back after the full cycle, and S^2 is conserved at the last, S^2-pulling stage). This allows us to avoid the third (S^2-)pulling by using the following approach: if the coupler is initially prepared in the (+1)-eigenstate of S^2, then $S^2 = +1$ during the third pulling operation, and thus this operation is trivial (the qubit spins keep their states) and can be left out. Hence, the third stage is not needed, simplifying the overall procedure. In the next paragraph we discuss a slight generalization of this procedure.

One Ising link is controlled by the S^3 coupler-spin component. In order to emulate other components, we manipulate the coupler spin via local fields. To minimally disturb the qubit state, this is done while the topological region is away from the coupler location. Let us follow the fate of the qubit and coupler operators in the process: the first and the third stage are the same as stage one (pulling) above, while the second stage is the coupler-spin rotation: $S^2 \to S^2$, $S^1 \to S^1\cos\theta + S^3\sin\theta$, $S^3 \to S^3\cos\theta - S^1\sin\theta$. Combination of the three stages (pulling the qubit through the coupler, rotation of the coupler, pulling the qubit back) gives, in particular, that S^2 is conserved, while $\tau^y \to \tau^y\cos\theta - \tau^z S^2\sin\theta$ and $\tau^z \to \tau^z\cos\theta + \tau^y S^2\sin\theta$. In other words, if the coupler was initially prepared, e.g., in the (+1) eigenstate of S^2 (cf. the next section), it remains in this state after the operation, that is, the coupler remains disentangled from the qubit. At the same time a 'braiding rotation' is performed on the qubit subspace: $\gamma_{\rm in} \to \gamma_{\rm in}\cos\theta + \gamma_{\rm out}\sin\theta$, $\gamma_{\rm out} \to \gamma_{\rm out}\cos\theta - \gamma_{\rm in}\sin\theta$.

V. BRAIDING ALGORITHM IN THE SPIN LANGUAGE

In this section we complement the previous discussions by an explicit calculation in the spin language. We assume that the chains $\alpha = 1$ and 2 are on the left and right side of the setup, and the coupling between the chains is controlled by S^3. We perform the following protocol: (i) We start with the topological qubit on the left side prepared in the state $|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, while the coupler is in the state $|\uparrow\rangle_S$. In other words, the initial state is the product state

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle_S \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \ . \tag{23}$$

(ii) We rotate the coupler around the x-axis by an angle ϕ, i.e., we apply the operation

$$U_\phi = \exp\left\{-\frac{i\phi}{2}S^x\right\} = \cos\frac{\phi}{2} - i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}S^x \ . \tag{24}$$

This gives

$$|\psi_1\rangle = U_\phi\,|\uparrow\rangle_S \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle = \left[\cos\frac{\phi}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S - i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \ . \tag{25}$$

(iii) We pull the topological qubit adiabatically to the right side. This gives

$$|\psi_2\rangle = \cos\frac{\phi}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S \otimes |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \ . \tag{26}$$

(iv) We rotate the coupler around the y-axis by an angle θ, i.e., we apply

$$U_\theta = \exp\left\{-\frac{i\theta}{2}S^y\right\} = \cos\frac{\theta}{2} - i\sin\frac{\theta}{2}S^y \ . \tag{27}$$

This produces

$$|\psi_3\rangle = \cos\frac{\phi}{2}\left[\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S + \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\left[\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S - \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \ . \tag{28}$$

(v) We pull the topological qubit back to the left side. This produces

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_4\rangle \ &= \ \left[\cos\frac{\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S - i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \\ &+ \ \left[\cos\frac{\phi}{2}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\rangle_S + i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

For $\phi = \pi/2$ (this corresponds to a preparation of an eigenstate of S^2 at step (ii) above) the resulting state is a product state

$$|\psi_4\rangle \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[|\uparrow\rangle_S - i\,|\downarrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes \left(\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + i\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\right) \ . \tag{30}$$

If, instead, we started with the state $|\psi_0'\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle_S \otimes |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, we would obtain

$$|\psi_4'\rangle \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[|\uparrow\rangle_S - i\,|\downarrow\rangle_S\right] \otimes \left(\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle + i\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\,|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle\right) \ . \tag{31}$$

Thus we perform a $(-\theta)$-rotation around the x-axis of the topological qubit, and after the operation the coupler is no longer entangled with the qubit. In the basis of the states with well-defined occupation numbers (parities) of the Dirac fermions, $(1/\sqrt{2})(|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \pm |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle)$, the achieved rotation is a $U(1)$ rotation around the z-axis, as expected[18].

VI. BRAIDING IN TERMS OF THE MAJORANA OPERATORS

A. Boundary translations

Assume that the topological interval is placed on one side of the coupler (that is, in one of the chains). The shift of the inner boundary of the interval towards the coupler, say, from spin $\vec{\sigma}_\alpha(k+1)$ to spin $\vec{\sigma}_\alpha(k)$ due to the adiabatic variation of the corresponding transverse field $h_\alpha(k)$ from $+\infty$ to 0 is given by the operator

$$T^{\rm in}_{k,\alpha} = \exp\bigl\{\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{\pi}{4}\,\sigma^z_\alpha(k+1)\,\sigma^y_\alpha(k)\bigr\} = \frac{1+\mathrm{i}\,\sigma^z_\alpha(k+1)\,\sigma^y_\alpha(k)}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1-\chi_\alpha(k+1)\,\chi_\alpha(k)}{\sqrt{2}}\ . \tag{32}$$

In particular, the zero-mode edge operator is shifted properly:

$$T^{\rm in}_{k,\alpha}\,\chi_\alpha(k+1)\,T^{{\rm in},\dagger}_{k,\alpha} = \chi_\alpha(k)\,. \tag{33}$$

The part of the boundary zero mode $\gamma_{\rm in}$ is played by $\chi_\alpha(k+1)$ before the shift and by $\chi_\alpha(k)$ after the shift. Similarly, the operator that shifts the outer boundary away from the coupler, i.e., from spin $\vec{\sigma}_\alpha(k)$ to spin $\vec{\sigma}_\alpha(k+1)$, reads

$$T^{\rm out}_{k,\alpha} = \exp\bigl(\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{\pi}{4}\,\sigma^z_\alpha(k)\,\sigma^y_\alpha(k+1)\bigr) = \frac{1+\mathrm{i}\,\sigma^z_\alpha(k)\,\sigma^y_\alpha(k+1)}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1-\eta_\alpha(k)\,\eta_\alpha(k+1)}{\sqrt{2}}\ . \tag{34}$$

Again, the corresponding zero-mode operator is shifted properly:

$$T^{\rm out}_{k,\alpha}\,\eta_\alpha(k)\,T^{{\rm out},\dagger}_{k,\alpha} = \eta_\alpha(k+1)\ . \tag{35}$$

If in the middle of the protocol the topological interval is shared by two chains, there are only outer boundaries, and only the operators $T^{\rm out}_{k,\alpha}$ and $(T^{\rm out}_{k,\alpha})^{-1} = T^{{\rm out},\dagger}_{k,\alpha}$ can be applied. The operator that transfers the inner boundary from chain α to chain β (where it becomes an outer boundary) reads

$$T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha} = \exp\Bigl(\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{\pi}{4}\,S^\gamma\sigma^z_\alpha(1)\,\sigma^y_\beta(1)\Bigr) = \frac{1+\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,\eta_\beta(1)}{\sqrt{2}}\ . \tag{36}$$

Here α, β, γ are mutually distinct, and $\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}\equiv\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ (which equals ±1 depending on whether the shift $\alpha\to\beta$ is in the clockwise/counter-clockwise direction). Here we obtain an extra minus sign while shifting the zero mode, i.e.,

$$T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\chi_\alpha(1)T^\dagger_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha} = -\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}\eta_\beta(1)\ , \tag{37}$$

which is consistent with the sign of (21). As expected, the operators S^α do not enter final expressions in the fermionic language. Yet, they remain important due to the non-trivial commutation relations (17).

B. Braiding in one-dimensional geometry

Here we explain how to perform braiding in the 1D geometry depicted in Fig. 2. We refer to this setup as a two-chain composite. Consider two chains $\alpha=1$ and $\beta=2$. We assume that, initially, the topological interval is limited by the inner boundary $N^{\rm in}_\alpha \gg 1$ and the outer boundary $N^{\rm out}_\alpha \gg N^{\rm in}_\alpha$. Thus, the zero mode is given by $\gamma_{\rm out}=\eta_\alpha(N^{\rm out}_\alpha)$ and $\gamma_{\rm in}=\chi_\alpha(N^{\rm in}_\alpha)$ (due to the inverse orientation of the chain $\alpha=1$, we avoid using left and right indices). Once the interval is transported to the chain β, the edges are located at $N^{\rm in}_\beta\gg1$ and $N^{\rm out}_\beta\gg N^{\rm in}_\beta$. To maintain an adiabatic regime, we have to transfer the inner boundary in α to the outer boundary in β and vice versa.

Now we construct the complete braiding operator:

$$U_{\rm br} = U^\dagger_R\,U_L\,U_y(\theta)\,U^\dagger_L\,U_R\ . \tag{38}$$

Here the rotation of the coupler in the middle of the protocol is described by

$$U_y(\theta) = \exp\bigl(-\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{\theta}{2}\,S^y\bigr) = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2} - \mathrm{i}\,\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}S^y\ . \tag{39}$$

The operator U_R describes the transport of the inner edge on the left side ($\alpha=1$) to the outer edge on the right side ($\beta=2$):

$$U_R = T^{\rm out}_\beta\,T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\,T^{\rm in}_\alpha\ , \tag{40}$$

where

$$T_\alpha^{\rm in} \equiv \prod_{k=1}^{k=N_\alpha^{\rm in}-1} T_{k,\alpha}^{\rm in} = \prod_{k=1}^{k=N_\alpha^{\rm in}-1} \frac{1-\chi_\alpha(k+1)\,\chi_\alpha(k)}{\sqrt{2}} \ , \tag{41}$$

and

$$T_\beta^{\rm out} \equiv \prod_{k=N_\beta^{\rm out}-1}^{k=1} T_{k,\beta}^{\rm out} = \prod_{k=N_\beta^{\rm out}-1}^{k=1} \frac{1-\eta_\beta(k)\,\eta_\beta(k+1)}{\sqrt{2}} \ . \tag{42}$$

Analogously, the operator U_L describes the transport of the inner edge on the right side ($\beta = 2$) to the outer edge on the left side ($\alpha = 1$):

$$U_L = T_\alpha^{\rm out} T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta} T_\beta^{\rm in} \ , \tag{43}$$

where we again use the definitions (41) and (42) with α and β interchanged.

We obtain

$$U_{\rm br} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2} - {\rm i}\,\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2} U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^y\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R \ . \tag{44}$$

Next

$$U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^y\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R = \left[T_\beta^{\rm out} T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha} T_\alpha^{\rm in}\right]^\dagger T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}\, T_\beta^{\rm in}\, S^y\, \left[T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}\, T_\beta^{\rm in}\right]^\dagger\, T_\beta^{\rm out} T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha} T_\alpha^{\rm in} \ . \tag{45}$$

Since, in our case, $S^y = S^2 = S^\beta$, we observe that S^β commutes with operators $T_{\alpha/\beta}^{\rm in}$ and $T_{\alpha/\beta}^{\rm out}$, whereas

$$S^\beta T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha} = T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}^\dagger S^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad S^\beta T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta} = T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger S^\beta \ . \tag{46}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^\beta\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R =& S^\beta \left[T_\beta^{\rm out} T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}^\dagger T_\alpha^{\rm in}\right]^\dagger T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger\, T_\beta^{\rm in}\, \left[T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}\, T_\beta^{\rm in}\right]^\dagger\, T_\beta^{\rm out}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm in} \\ =& S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\beta^{{\rm out},\dagger}\, T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger\, T_\beta^{\rm in}\, T_\beta^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger\, T_\alpha^{{\rm out},\dagger}\, T_\beta^{\rm out}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm in} \\ =& S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\beta^{{\rm out},\dagger}\, T_\alpha^{\rm out}\, [T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger]^2\, T_\alpha^{{\rm out},\dagger}\, T_\beta^{\rm out}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm in} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

We notice that $[T_{\alpha\leftarrow\beta}^\dagger]^2 = \Lambda_{\beta\alpha}\,\eta_\alpha(1)\,\chi_\beta(1)$. This immediately allows us to commute $T_\beta^{\rm out}$ and $T_\beta^{{\rm out},\dagger}$ out since these consist only of $\eta_\beta(k)$. We, thus, obtain

$$U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^\beta\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R = S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm out} \Lambda_{\beta\alpha}\ \eta_\alpha(1)\,\chi_\beta(1)\, T_\alpha^{{\rm out},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm in} \ . \tag{48}$$

Further, we observe that $T_\alpha^{\rm out}\eta_\alpha(1)T_\alpha^{{\rm out},\dagger} = \eta_\alpha(N_\alpha^{\rm out}) = \gamma_{\rm out}$, as the edge transport relation (35) suggests. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^\beta\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R =& \Lambda_{\beta\alpha}\, S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, \gamma_{\rm out}\, \chi_\beta(1)\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}\, T_\alpha^{\rm in} \\ =& \Lambda_{\beta\alpha}\, S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, T_{\beta\leftarrow\alpha}^2\, T_\alpha^{\rm in}\, \gamma_{\rm out}\, \chi_\beta(1) \\ =& \Lambda_{\beta\alpha}\, S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger} \Lambda_{\alpha\beta}\, \chi_\alpha(1)\, \eta_\beta(1)\, T_\alpha^{\rm in}\, \gamma_{\rm out}\, \chi_\beta(1) \\ =& -\, S^\beta\, T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\, \chi_\alpha(1)\, T_\alpha^{\rm in}\, \chi_\beta(1)\, \eta_\beta(1)\, \gamma_{\rm out} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Finally we use (33) and obtain $T_\alpha^{{\rm in},\dagger}\,\chi_\alpha(1)\,T_\alpha^{\rm in} = \chi_\alpha(N_\alpha^{\rm in}) = \gamma_{\rm in}$. This gives

$$U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^\beta\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R = -S^\beta\,\chi_\beta(1)\,\eta_\beta(1)\,\gamma_{\rm in}\,\gamma_{\rm out} \ . \tag{50}$$

Since the system remains in the ground-state subspace, and after the completion of the protocol $h_\beta(1) = +\infty$, we observe from (7) that the first spin in the β chain is frozen so that $\langle\chi_\beta(1)\,\eta_\beta(1)\rangle = -{\rm i}\langle\sigma_\beta^x(1)\rangle = -{\rm i}$. We, thus, finally obtain

$$U_R^\dagger\, U_L\, S^\beta\, U_L^\dagger\, U_R = {\rm i}\, S^\beta\,\gamma_{\rm in}\,\gamma_{\rm out} \ , \tag{51}$$

and

$$U_{\rm br} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2} + \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2} S^y \gamma_{\rm in}\,\gamma_{\rm out} \ . \tag{52}$$

This result coincides exactly with that obtained using the spin representation. I.e., if the coupler was initially prepared in the (-1)-eigenstate of S^y, we induce a $(-\theta)$-rotation of the topological qubit, described by $U_{\rm br} = \cos\frac{\theta}{2} - \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\gamma_{\rm in}\,\gamma_{\rm out} = \exp\left[-\frac{\theta}{2}\gamma_{\rm in}\,\gamma_{\rm out}\right]$, whereas the coupler remains disentangled from the qubit.



FIG. 3: Practical realisation of qubits chains with Josephson junction circuits. **a**: Basic states of the gradiometer flux qubit. A permanent flux of half a flux quantum is applied to each loop. Tunnelling occurs through one smaller junction denoted by α. **b**: Driving of the qubit by changing of the tunnelling strength (σ_x) or the flux bias (σ_z). **c**: Layout of the system with two chains (left and right) and the coupler (center).

VII. PHYSICAL REALISATION OF THE 3-SPIN COUPLING

The effective coupling of the type $H^S_{\rm int} = -J_{12}\sigma^z_1(1)\sigma^z_2(1)\,S^1$ (this coupling is equivalent to that considered above upon substitution $S^1 \leftrightarrow S^3$) can be realised as follows. Consider three spins $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}$ coupled by the following Hamiltonian

$$H = v_1\sigma^z_1 S^z + v_2\sigma^z_2 S^z - \Delta S^x \ , \tag{53}$$

where $\Delta \gg v_1, v_2$. Under these conditions one can treat the couplings v_1 and v_2 perturbatively with $H_0 = -\Delta S^x$ and the perturbation $V = (v_1\sigma^z_1 + v_2\sigma^z_2)S^z$.

A Schrieffer-Wolf transformation $\tilde{H} = e^{-R}\,H\,e^{R}$ with

$$R = -\frac{{\rm i}S^y}{2\Delta}(v_1\sigma^z_1 + v_2\sigma^z_2) \ . \tag{54}$$

yields $[H_0, R]_- = -V$. We thus find the new Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} \approx H_0 + \frac{1}{2}\,[V,R]_- = -\Delta S^x - \frac{S^x}{2\Delta}(v_1\sigma^z_1 + v_2\sigma^z_2)^2 = -\tilde{\Delta}S^x - \frac{v_1v_2}{\Delta}\,\sigma^z_1\,\sigma^z_2\,S^x \ , \tag{55}$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta + \frac{v_1^2+v_2^2}{2\Delta}$. This produces the desired interaction with $J_{12} = \frac{v_1v_2}{\Delta}$ if we transform to the rotating frame with respect to the term $-\tilde{\Delta}S^x$.

In a realistic situation we have to include the terms corresponding to the transverse fields acting on the spins $\vec{\sigma}_1$, $\vec{\sigma}_2$, i.e., $-h_1\sigma^x_1$ and $-h_2\sigma^x_2$ into H_0. A straightforward calculation shows that our conclusions remain intact as long as $\Delta \gg h_{1,2}$. Formally, also the limit $\Delta \ll h_{1,2}$ is possible (the effective coupling is then of the order $\Delta v_1v_2/h^2_{1,2}$). However, in this limit, once the spins $\vec{\sigma}_1$, $\vec{\sigma}_2$ are being "frozen" and "defrozen", one would have to go through the resonance $\Delta = h_{1,2}$, where unwanted transitions would happen. Thus, we require $\Delta \gg h_{1,2}$ at all stages of the protocol. One can also show that the terms describing the coupling of $\vec{\sigma}_1$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2$ to the further spins of the respective chains as well as the driving term $-\Omega(t)S^z$ acting on the coupler are only slightly modified by the transformation (54).

VIII. PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

A practical implementation can be realised by means of Josephson junction circuits. The flux qubits are particularly suited because a strong coupling between them is easy to achieve and their tunnelling strength, which plays here the

role of the transverse field, can be efficiently tuned[12]. A possible circuit is illustrated in Fig. 3. It consists of a chain of gradiometer flux qubits[12]. An individual gradiometer qubit is shown in Fig. 3a. It is an advanced version of the flux qubit[16] (persistent current qubit with a characteristic smaller junction denoted by α), in which the outer inductance loop is replaced by two symmetrically placed loops. The two states denoted by $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$ (eigenstates of σ^z) are the persistent current states depicted in Fig. 3a. The amplitude of tunnelling between $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$, denoted here by h, is controlled by the Josephson energy of the α-junction, which can be tuned by replacing it with a two-junction SQUID loop (see Fig. 3b). The gradiometer geometry allows tuning the α-junction without affecting the bias energy between $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$. Typical values could be: qubit tunnelling strength $h = 2\pi\hbar \times 1$GHz within the topological region and $h = 2\pi\hbar \times 9$GHz outside. The gradiometer inductive loops contain further Josephson junctions; the strength of the nearest-neighbour coupling can be varied by their number. The nearest-neighbour coupling could be $J = 2\pi\hbar \times 3$GHz.

The coupler is a special gradiometer qubit with a particularly strong tunnelling, denoted here by Δ (see Eq. (53)). We envision $\Delta = 2\pi\hbar \times 15$GHz. Moreover, an extra magnetic bias (z-bias) is needed in order to perform NMR-like rotations of the coupler. This bias can be described by adding to the Hamiltonian a term $H_z = -\Omega(t)S^z$. The coupling between the coupler and the first qubits of the chains can be made as strong as $v_{1/2} = 2\pi\hbar \times 8$GHz (see Eq. (53)). This is achieved by placing extra Josephson junctions into the legs mutual to the coupler and the first qubits (Fig. 3c). These numbers are given as examples, they can be realised with available technology.

Switching of the individual qubits of the chains as well as of the coupler can be effected in a few nanoseconds while the coherence time can be above 10μs[17]. This will allow at least 1000 operations, enough to slide the topological region (5 qubits long) through the coupler and back.

IX. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have proposed a 1D Ising setup which allows performing parity conserving rotations of a Majorana qubit by an arbitrary angle. This is achieved by placing a special spin-1/2 (coupler) in one of the Ising links in the middle of the chain. The coupler controls the sign (ferro- or anti-ferromagnetic) of that Ising link. This setup emerged in the search for methods to implement (non-protected) topological braiding in Ising chains. The well-known problem is the fact that the Jordan-Wigner transformation, which maps the Ising problem onto the fermionic one, is strictly one-dimensional. Placing a coupler between three Ising chains allows circumventing this obstacle but requires a very special kind of coupling. Here we show that the same can be achieved in 1D if one is able to manipulate the coupler between the adiabatic passages of the ferromagnetic (topological) domain through the Ising link controlled by the coupler.

Our protocol could possibly be generalised. One prospective possibility is to rotate the coupler during sliding of the topological (ferromagnetic) domains. This could induce non-trivial Berry phases.

X. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by DFG and RSF under RSF grant No. 16-42-01035 and DFG grant No. SH 81/4-1 as well as DFG grant No. SH 81/3-1, DFG CRC183, and the Minerva foundation.

[1] A. Yu. Kitaev. Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires. *Physics-Uspekhi*, 44(10S):131, 2001.
[2] Yuval Oreg, Gil Refael, and Felix von Oppen. Helical liquids and Majorana bound states in quantum wires. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:177002, Oct 2010.
[3] Chetan Nayak, Steven H. Simon, Ady Stern, Michael Freedman, and Sankar Das Sarma. Non-abelian anyons and topological quantum computation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 80:1083, 2008.
[4] Jason Alicea, Yuval Oreg, Gil Refael, Felix von Oppen, and Matthew P. A. Fisher. Non-abelian statistics and topological quantum information processing in 1d wire networks. *Nature Physics*, 7(5):412–417, 05 2011.
[5] Martin Greiter, Vera Schnells, and Ronny Thomale. The 1d Ising model and the topological phase of the Kitaev chain. *Annals of Physics*, 351:1026 – 1033, 2014.
[6] Yaroslav Tserkovnyak and Daniel Loss. Universal quantum computation with ordered spin-chain networks. *Phys. Rev. A*, 84:032333, Sep 2011.
[7] A Mezzacapo, J Casanova, L Lamata, and E Solano. Topological qubits with majorana fermions in trapped ions. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(3):033005, 2013.
[8] Jin-Shi Xu, Kai Sun, Yong-Jian Han, Chuan-Feng Li, Jiannis K. Pachos, and Guang-Can Guo. Simulating the exchange of Majorana zero modes with a photonic system. *Nature Communications*, 7:13194 EP –, 10 2016.

[9] Jin-Shi Xu, Kai Sun and Jiannis K. Pachos, Yong-Jian Han, Chuan-Feng Li, and Guang-Can Guo. Experimental simulation of Majorana-based quantum computation. *arXiv:1702.08407*, 2017.
[10] L. S. Levitov, T. P. Orlando, J. B. Majer, and J. E. Mooij. Quantum spin chains and Majorana states in arrays of coupled qubits. *cond-mat/0108266*, 2001.
[11] B. van Heck, A. R. Akhmerov, F. Hassler, M. Burrello, and C. W. J. Beenakker. Coulomb-assisted braiding of Majorana fermions in a Josephson junction array. *New Journal of Physics*, 14(3):035019, 2012.
[12] F. G. Paauw, A. Fedorov, C. J. P. M Harmans, and J. E. Mooij. Tuning the gap of a superconducting flux qubit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:090501, Mar 2009.
[13] N. Crampé and A. Trombettoni. Quantum spins on star graphs and the Kondo model. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 871(3):526–538, 2013.
[14] A. M. Tsvelik. Majorana fermion realization of a two-channel Kondo effect in a junction of three quantum Ising chains. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:147202, Apr 2013.
[15] J. Q. You, Z. D. Wang, Wenxian Zhang, and Franco Nori. Encoding a qubit with Majorana modes in superconducting circuits. *Scientific Reports*, 4:5535 EP –, 07 2014.
[16] J. E. Mooij, T. P. Orlando, L. Levitov, Lin Tian, Caspar H. van der Wal, and Seth Lloyd. Josephson persistent-current qubit. *Science*, 285(5430):1036–1039, 1999.
[17] Fei Yan, Simon Gustavsson, Archana Kamal, Jeffrey Birenbaum, Adam P Sears, David Hover, Ted J. Gudmundsen, Danna Rosenberg, Gabriel Samach, S Weber, Jonilyn L. Yoder, Terry P. Orlando, John Clarke, Andrew J. Kerman, and William D. Oliver. The flux qubit revisited to enhance coherence and reproducibility. *Nature Communications*, 7:12964, 11 2016.
[18] The frozen spins are in the state $|\rightarrow_x\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)$. If this spin "joins" the $|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ chain the rotation is performed by $U = \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\pi/4)\,\sigma_y\right]$. We have $U\,|\rightarrow_x\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$. If the frozen spin "joins" the $|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ chain the rotation is by $U^\dagger = \exp\left[-\mathrm{i}(\pi/4)\,\sigma_y\right]$. We obtain $U^\dagger\,|\rightarrow_x\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle$. Thus, no extra sign appears.